













## Poetry.

For the Liberator.

## LINES.

On hearing of the noble generosity of our American brethren to our suffering operatives.

Ye have compared us, oh brothers!  
Though not on battle-field;  
For our hearts are taken captive  
By the generous aid ye yield.  
Ye had heard of our poor workmen,  
Their starving babes and wives;  
Of their patient, brave endurance,  
Though famine waste their lives;  
Of their homes, once filled with comfort,  
Now stripped to the bare wall—  
For their hands can find no labor—  
And ye pitying heard their call;  
For ye felt they were your brothers—  
For both boast the same descent  
From the stern, unyielding Briton,  
Long by Roman yoke bent;  
From the indomitable Vikings,  
Claiming empire of the sea;  
From the proud and valiant Normans,  
And from merchants, brave and free;  
We speak the same heroic language,  
Read the same heroic page;  
Both are proud of our old poets,  
And old writers, learned and sage.  
Be there no more strife between us,  
Causing misery and tears,  
But the strife of loving brothers,  
In the blessed coming years;  
The kind strife of loving brothers,  
How to do each other good,  
Leaving other States the glory  
Dearly bought by woe and blood!  
What a noble, great example  
All nations then will see,  
When America and Britain,  
The nations of the free,  
All old jealousies forgotten,  
Honor each other's worth;  
And in small things though they differ,  
Yet agree to bless God's earth!

Hastings, Sussex, England. JANE ARBUTHNOT.

## For the Liberator.

## EMANCIPATION.

Tune—Auld Lang Syne.

I.  
'Tis done!—the righteous deed is done!  
Freedman! the jubilee  
Columbia hails her faithful son,  
The Father of the free!  
The Father, &c.  
II.  
Aloft the signal flag is raised—  
The swift wind's tidings fly:  
"Glory to God! his name be praised!"  
Unnumber'd tongues reply.  
Unnumber'd, &c.  
III.  
Fair Freedom lifts her drooping head—  
A smile her tears restrain;  
Though mourning still her noble dead,  
Who died to break her chain.  
Who died, &c.  
IV.  
A blessing on our Chief's name,  
Who gave the grand command;  
Engrave it on the rock of fame,  
He freed his NATIVE LAND!  
He freed, &c.  
V.  
And let the listening nation hear,  
Throughout creation's bound,  
That Freedom has her dwelling here—  
Her land is holy ground!  
Her land, &c.  
VI.  
A refuge for the suffering poor,  
A home for the oppressed,  
She opens wide her friendly door,  
And feeds them from her breast.  
And feeds, &c.  
VII.  
No more, his slaves with weeping din,  
The eyes uplifted pine;  
The stripes and stars now shelter him—  
The sun of Freedom shines.  
The sun, &c.  
VIII.  
Huzza! proclaim the jubilee!  
Let grateful anthems rise!  
"Huzza! Columbia's land is free!"  
Re-echoes through the skies.  
Re-echoes, &c.  
IX.  
Now let the forest of angels come,  
With foreign hosts allied,  
One tap on Freedom's hallowed drum,  
The world is on our side!  
The world, &c.

Weymouth. P. M. ADAMS.

## PROCLAMATION LINES—Jan. 1st, 1863.

BY A. M. THOMSON.

I heard the silver voice of angels cry,  
And Echo sent it all along the sky,  
"Hosanna unto Him who sits on high!"  
"Yes, glory be to Him that we should see  
With these poor eyes this day of jubilee,  
And one more day of waiting souls set free."  
And as the word of portals was unrolled,  
I saw them writing in their books of gold,  
The date that all the prophets had foretold.  
And while they wrote it with their pens afflame,  
The patriot souls of every age and name,  
Made Heaven vocal with their glad acclaim!  
The stars grew brighter in the firmament,  
And every tongue that sang in Heaven lent  
Its voice, and down to earth the anthem sent.  
The earth prolonged the glorious strain,  
And Freedom was the grand refrain  
Of every color, creed and name.  
The eyes that used to fill with liquid pain,  
To-day are full of solemn tears again,  
But tears of joy to see the melting chain!  
Bask in the action-blessed and cruel throng,  
Back to barbarian night where they belong,  
And let this race lift up its natal song!  
They shall not feel the bloodhound's snarling gash,  
Or know the sting and pain of well-placed lash,  
Or the dumb ache when fenshian passions clash.  
But over in the arch of their dark sky,  
The sacred bow of promise hangs on high—  
Their hopes of being free no more can die!  
Let tyrants sigh, and draw their last lament,  
The arrow to their idol's heart is sent:  
God bless the archer who the bow hath bent!  
O, sacred Liberty! how dear art thou!  
Now radiant as the youth upon thy brow!  
And never half so beautiful as now!

## SUPPLICATION.

Lord, deliver! thou canst save,  
Save from evil, mighty God;  
Hear, O hear, the kneeling slave!  
Break, O break, the oppressor's rod!  
Love to man and love to God,  
Be the weapons of our war;  
These can break the oppressor's rod,  
Burn the bonds that we abhor.

## The Liberator.

GERRIT SMITH TO GOVERNOR SEYMOUR.

PETERBORO', JAN. 12, 1863.

DEAR SIR,—I have read your Message. Although I belong to no party, I belong to a country. Although there are no party interests for me to promote and adjust myself to, I feel the preciousness of the interests of my country, and am deeply and abidingly concerned for their safety. Scarcely more than when reading your Message have I felt the great peril of these interests; for I remember the utterance of its dangerous doctrines is, emphatically, if not indeed pre-eminently, the mouthpiece of a party comprising nearly half the voters of the Free States. I remember, too, what great weight with its party have the words of a gentleman of commanding talents, high culture, multiplied influential public relations, bland and winning manners, admired social and domestic life. How could I fail to fear that the Democratic party, if not already fully identified with these dangerous doctrines, will, by force of such commendations of them, soon become so?

I find denunciation in your Message, but no denunciation of the rebels. The Cotton States and the New England States do, in your esteem, share about equally in the guilt of the Rebellion! New England, because she suffered her Garrison to write against slavery, and her Phillips to talk against it, is in your eyes as criminal as the bloody men who flew at the throat of their unoffending country! New England, who, to help put them down, promptly armed hundreds of thousands of her cherished sons, and promptly poured out scores of millions of her wealth, has no less of your censure than any other State. And yet you propose to put down the Rebellion! But how can this be done, if nearly half of us are like yourself? How could we have the heart to do it, even at little cost—much less at the required cost—if the rebels are no worse than the people of New England? And how, if we had the heart, would it be practicable, should you succeed, as is your too manifest intent, in arraying the Western and Central States against New England instead of the Rebellion?

I see you still regret that the satanic compromise proposed two years ago was not adopted. I call it satanic, because it was to be a compromise between two guilty parties at the sole expense—and this, too, an overwhelming expense—of an innocent third party. Fresh outrages were to be heaped upon the negro—say, and eternized. The malignity of this Democratic compromise, which not a few Republicans also favored, (for there are Republicans too who are capable of being satanized,) is equalled only by its meanness. That they, who could propose further and greater crimes against the guiltless and helpless, could still make much account of their Bibles and churches, argues either their matchless delusion or their matchless brazenness. I do not say that they would have thereby made themselves infinitely more consistent.

3d. "The claim of power under martial law" you indignantly and utterly refuse to admit. You say that this claim "asserts that the President may, in his discretion, declare war." I do not believe that it does, and I never before heard that it does. You say that it "exalts the military power of the President above his constitutional rights." I reply that this power is specifically one of those rights, inasmuch as the Constitution makes him the Head of the Army. I admit that he has no other official rights than what the Constitution gives him; and you should admit that it is only from martial law, or, in other words, the law of civilized warfare, that he can learn the measure of his rights as Head of the Army. You say that this "measure is fixed by the Constitution." Rather is it fixed by this martial law which you disparage. It also changes with this law, which changes with the progress of civilization. It is true that Congress has power to prescribe rules for war; but, on the other hand, it is not only true that it could not provide for a large share of the cases in which the Head of the Army might find himself, but also true that this power of Congress is to be exercised within the limits and according to the character of martial law. So long as that law shall forbid the poisoning of food or water, or the killing of prisoners, or the selling of them into slavery, Congress has no power to authorize these barbarisms. That a nation may carry on war according to its own laws, be they what they will, Christendom would never suffer. These laws must be conformable to the law of civilized warfare. If it is true, as recently reported, that the rebels shot twenty prisoners because they were black, and if also their government should approve it, then will this enormous violation of the conventions of war not only go far to reveal the character of the rebels to the eyes of Europe, but it will also go far to damage their cause with her.

4th. Scouting as you do the doctrine of martial law, it is not strange that you deny the right of the Head of the Army to lay hands, even in time of war, on persons in a loyal State. Indeed, you do not admit that he may on persons in a revolted one. You decline saying whether such a State has lost any of its rights. Your language clearly implies that it has not lost them all. Here, as well as elsewhere in the Message, you treat the rebels as mere "sinners against God." Doubtless, you hold that State sovereignty can never die—no, not even in a State whose people have all turned traitors! Possibly, however, you would admit that the Head of the Army has the right to dispose of the hundred Missouri traitors, who, just within the North line of Arkansas, are plotting and promoting the destruction of our army and country. But how farcical the distinction that he may not dispose of them, if availing themselves of your theory, they return a mile, and claim that they can now perpetrate their treason with impunity, because they are again in their loyal State of Missouri! Moreover, Missouri might, at the time, be the principal seat of the war, and the very State in which traitors could most peril and damage our cause. Whilst writing this letter, I learn that Springfield in Missouri is besieged by rebels. Does not our army there need the right to make the quick and sure military dispositions of both open and suspected traitors? Surely it does: and what folly, not to say what treason, to deny the right, simply because Springfield is in one of the really or nominally loyal States! Upon your theory, a single State, though no larger than Rhode Island or Delaware, might, under its mask of loyalty, harbor traitors and protecting their operations, accomplish the betrayal of the country into the hands of the enemy. Surely, surely, our nation could not have meant to leave herself at such fatal disadvantage! She could not have failed to mean that, in time of war, her military power should be free everywhere within her borders to deal with traitors in its own sure and summary ways, where they could not safely be entrusted to slow, uncertain, and what, even though in a professedly loyal State, might prove to be disloyal proceedings. If it be but one State that has broken out in war against the nation, the war power, nevertheless, is entitled to its paramount rule in every State, so long as the war shall continue. So long it must have the right to practise in every State its own means for saving all the States. The military power may not dispose of a man in a loyal State! Amazing error! It may not only arrest him, but reduce his dwelling to ashes. The Head of the Army may, and should, order the arrest of the people of Chambersburg, and the burning of their town, if he is convinced that it is, and if unborn will remain, a nest of traitors. Had it been your purpose so to cripple the President and his army as to render the country an easy prey to its enemy, you could not have written more effectually to this end than you have done. You say: "The unlimited, uncontrolled despotic power claimed under martial law is, of itself, a reason why it cannot be admitted." The answer is, that for this very reason, the power must be admitted. No nation ever did

or ever can stand, that does not make martial law supreme in time of war. The main reason why the comparatively petty South is still able to resist the gigantic North is that the one has, and the other has not, a Democratic party to hold it back from an unrestricted and successful prosecution of the war. The rebels "let slip the dogs of war"; but the Democrats are constantly intent on leashing ours. You will argue the danger of the abuse of this martial law; but that will be no argument against the necessity of the law. It will be an argument only against the madness of running rashly into war.

5th. You deny the right of the Head of the Army to proclaim liberty to the slaves of loyalists. You seem to believe that our Government must not only not intend injuries to loyalists, but must so conduct the war that not even incidental injuries, though afterwards paid for, shall ever befall them. The military commander is, however, at as full liberty to burn the dwelling of the loyalist as of the rebel, if in his judgment the necessities of war call for it. It is his right to weaken the foe by calling away from him white or red or black men. He may strengthen his ranks by inviting to them the minor sons of loyal fathers, and the apprentices of loyal masters. But if he may invite these to break away from their just and natural relations, how much more may he invite slaves, be it those of rebels or loyalists, to break away from their infinitely unjust and unnatural relations! He may not think the slaves to be in any wise fit for his ranks. He may (and this would be an entirely justifying reason) invite them to leave their rebellious or loyal masters, simply because he would thereby reduce the forces which produce the food and other elements of Southern subsistence and Southern success. In all this, the commander would not be saying that the relation of master and slave is any less moral than the other relations referred to. He would but be saying that he feels bound to do whatever he can, in accordance with the laws and usages of civilized warfare, to weaken his foe and strengthen himself.

6th. Our work, as you interpret it, is to save the Constitution as it is, and to "restore our Union as it was before the outbreak of the war." Right here, at this great error, is it probable that our nation will perish, if perished it must. The breaking out of the Rebellion found the nation so debauched by slavery as to be incapable of meeting the Rebellion on the one square and simple issue of putting it down. For thirty or forty years it had cherished, not to say worshipped, slavery; and nearly all its contests during that time, for the Constitution and the Union, were virtually contests for slavery. Hence, she had scarcely come to blows with the South before the North found her people divided by feigned, false, impertinent and ruinous issues. Loud and incessant was the cry, that the Constitution and Union must be restored. The Democrats and pro-slavery Republicans meant a restoration to the intensely pro-slavery interpretation that the one, and the intensely pro-slavery character that the other, had reached when the Rebellion broke out. The anti-slavery Republicans were for restoring the Constitution and Union to what they were held to be in those early days of the Republic when slavery was looked upon as sectional and liberty national. A part of the Abolitionists said that the Constitution is anti-slavery, and that, therefore, in the name of the Constitution, as well as in the name of God, the Union should also be anti-slavery; and another part said that the Constitution is pro-slavery, and that they preferred the Union at all to a Union under a pro-slavery Constitution.

Oh! had we but been uncorrupted by slavery, how quickly would we have put down the Rebellion, if indeed there could, in that case, have been a Rebellion to put down! We should then have wasted no time, and produced no division amongst ourselves, by talking about the Union, the Constitution, or even the country. Our one purpose then would have been to put down the rebels, and to put them down irrespective of the bearing it might have on whatever interests. Naked plunderers and murderers were these entirely unworried rebels; and they should have been put down with a total disregard of consequences as would characterize the single purpose of a stern father in putting down his revolted child.

Who doubts that, with such a disregard, they had been put down instantly? Suppose that commanders in Union—your adopted and my native home—had, with arms in their hands, and using them too, seized her funds, her fire engines, and her other corporate property, and that you, at that time, been her Mayor—would you have sent to the Common Council a message of the tone and character of that you have just sent to the Legislature? Would you have sought in it to divide her citizens upon a multiplicity of issues respecting the future condition of her Fire Department, her funds and other interests? Oh, no! oh, no! You could have made no Democratic and no other gain by such an insane policy. You would, beyond a doubt, have sought to unite them in the one purpose and one endeavor to subdue and punish the mercenaries; to subdue and punish them, come what might of Fire Department, Funds, or even Utopia herself. I am wrong—they would already have been thus united. Such union would have been the necessary result of the outrage. Only bad counsels and partisan influences could have dissuaded them. The people of the North were united when they heard of the bombardment of Sumter. But, alas! our good and patriotic President temporized! The state, which should have been taken at the flood, was allowed time to subside. Hundreds and thousands of lives, and directly and indirectly, thousands of millions of dollars, have already been the penalty of this mistake—and only too reasonable is the fear that the loss of the nation will be needed to complete the penalty. How surely and how quickly would he at that time, but for the timidity and hesitancy which grew out of his pro-slavery education, have saved our wealth and toil from this oppressive taxation, our tens of thousands of bereaved families from their sorrows, and our country from the appalling prospect of her ruin! The Rebellion should have been dead at once. Whoever denies it, proves therein that he is insensible of its infernal character, and knows not how to deal with such a crime. Or rather, whoever denies it, makes room thereby for the supposition that he sympathizes with the Rebellion, and is a participant in the crime. At once should the President have brought out the Big Emancipation Gun; and he should have so charged it, and so aimed it, as not to spare one shred of slavery in all the land. The Rebellion would have been ended by the first fire. And what right had the rebels to our shrinking and delay—rebels who, without the least protection, so malignantly and murderously struck at our all—the life of our country, and therefore at our all?

7th. What a sad exhibition of the power of ambition and party over a great intellect, combined with a gentle and refined spirit, is your insisting that slavery shall be re-established; that the Southern "elements of production must be unimpaired"; and that nothing short of this "can command the support of the majority of the American people"! Yes, even now, when, if there ever was, there is no longer any Constitutional obstacle in the way of the slave's freedom—even now, when the slaveholder has himself opened the prison door—you are still determined that he shall remain in bondage, and his children and children's children after him; still determined that this shall continue to be a land in which multiplying millions have no right to husband, nor wife, nor children, nor wages, nor Bibles, nor schools, nor to aught else but stripes and insults, tortures of the body, and tortures of the soul! You are indeed to be pitied. You were not made to be what you are. You were made to be a strong and helpful and sustaining brother among your poor and needy and weak brethren: not an object of terror, but a tower of safety to them. You were not made to bolt but to unbolt the door of the oppressed; not to extinguish but to multiply and realize their hopes. But, alas! your party turned and defiled itself with it; that the party can live only in the life of the monster, and must die when the monster

dies. Hence it is that you are what you are. You are stone blind, both morally and politically. You see not God's hand in this war. You see not that his time has at last come for setting free his sable children. So deluded are you, as to imagine that slavery will be popular for ever, and abolition unpopular for ever. But the sun of the Seymours, and Rynders, and Woods will soon set in darkness; and the sun of the Garrigues, and Phillips, and Cheever will soon rise in splendor. Your spurious Democratic party, deserted as it is by the Dickinsons and Butters and by all who love country more than party, and freedom more than slavery, will soon pass away, leaving History to tell on one of her blackest pages of a base and wicked party as ever defied God or trampled on man.

Your former and your present friend,  
GERRIT SMITH.

## THE BOSTON REVIEW ON SAWYER'S RECONSTRUCTION OF BIBLICAL THEORIES.

REMARKS BY THE AUTHOR—No. II.

MR. EDITOR:—The Boston Review commences its article with an introduction entirely out of place in the consideration of any serious, honest and earnest work on Biblical science. It deplores "the lifting up of axes on the thick trees of God, and breaking down the carved work of the sanctuary"; it knows that "learning must have its play-ground, and that there must be a place for target practice, and a field for knight-errantry; but wishes it would not seize on sacred enclosures." It then adds—"Can we not have a substitute on which learned criticism may expend itself without injury to our most sacred interests? Could not the Vedas or the Iliad serve the purposes of this profound scholarship, as well as the sacred oracles?"—p. 685.

Doubtless, inquiry may expend itself on other objects. The field of knowledge is large, and admits an infinite variety of labors. The Vedas may be further studied; and so may the Iliad, with some valuable results; but why may not the Bible be studied too? Does any principle of truth or duty interdict its study? And if men may study the Bible, may they not report what they find in it? The reconstructionist is not treating the Bible as a field for target practice, nor a play-ground for literary amusement, but as a valuable collection of ancient works to be read and interpreted, and made serviceable in the instruction of the human race on the most important subjects of human inquiry. An educated friend of Christianity is the last man in the world who should perpetrate the most thorough study of the Bible. If it cannot bear to be studied, it had better be laid aside for something that can. The reconstructionist is not a stranger to the Bible; he has studied it many years, and endeavored to understand it. In early life, he was thoroughly instructed in the common views, and held them for many years; latterly, he has been obliged to abandon them for others, which he now submits to the public, and on which he asks its deliberate and well-considered judgment. There is a field of knowledge in regard to the Bible, as in regard to other books, embracing things that can be known about it and known by it. This field the reconstructionist has endeavored to enter, and in some degree to explore. His volume reports some of his findings, and submits them to the judgment of Christendom. He wishes to have them honestly and truly judged, and expects to abide by such a judgment when reached. The Boston Review, in its article for November, 1862, has, unfortunately, not reached it. How entirely it fails to have appeared in part from a previous article. It is proposed on the present occasion to note some others of its shortcomings.

2. "To one familiar with the history of doctrines, the views here given will show no novelty. It would be easy to cite authorities for the most, if not all of them."—p. 686.  
This is incorrect. The views here given embrace much that is new. The views of the author have been anticipated by no German, English or French writers, and are now for the first time submitted to the attention and examination of Christians. Any one who can confound them with the views of earlier writers is either ignorant of earlier writers and misjudges them, or else has not taken pains to understand the author, and misrepresents him.  
The Review says, "We have no fears for the truth." This is well; he need have none, for two reasons: first, the author has no hostile intentions against it, and, second, truth is naturally invulnerable and immortal. It is not liable to ultimate injury, even by the malice of its enemies. It shares the throne with the Eternal, and can no more fall than He.

"It sits on no precarious throne,  
Nor borrows leave to be."  
It waits its time in neglect, and sometimes in dishonor; but a future eternity is the predestined period and theatre of its triumphs and glories.

3. "The crossing of the Jordan was commemorated by a stone heap; the altar of witness erected by the sons of Ephraim, Gad and Manasseh, was a commemorative monument, that could not have been necessary if letters had existed in those times."—Reconstruction, p. 9. On this the reviewer remarks thus:—

"That is, the erection of Bunker Hill Monument is proof that letters were not in use in New England at that time, and the erection of Webster at the laying of its corner-stone was the composition of some allegorist in a later age."—p. 638.  
There is some difference between a rude stone heap, consisting of twelve stones, supposed to have been piled up on the bank of the Jordan after the nation had crossed, and Bunker Hill Monument, with its inscriptions. Bunker Hill Monument demonstrates by its inscriptions the use of English letters, at the time of its erection, and is itself a most elaborate and expensive work of art. A pile of twelve stones, with no structure and no inscription, marks a rude altar, and an illiterate people. Such the altar of Joshua must have judged the age and people whom he thus described to be. All that the stone heap shows is the judgment of the writer as to what was a fit monument of the crossing of the Jordan. The absence of letters from this memorial is an indication that, in his judgment, they were not in use under Joshua.

The altar of testimony is a still stronger evidence against the use of Aramean letters under Joshua. "The mighty one of gods, Jera, the mighty one of gods, Jera, knows, and Israel shall know; if in rebellion and if in transgression against Jera, save us not this day; [if] we have built for us an altar to turn away from after Jera, and to offer on it sacrifices and burnt-offerings, and to sacrifice on it peace-offerings, let Jera himself require it; and if for fear of this thing, we have not done this, saying, In time to come, your sons will speak to our sons, saying, What part have you in Jera, the God of Israel? And Jera has set a boundary between us and you, sons of Jera and sons of Gad—the Jordan; you have no part in Jera; and your sons shall make our sons come from the fear of Jera. And we said, Let us now make for us and build an altar, not for burnt-offerings nor for sacrifices, but for a witness between us and you, and between our generations after us, that we perform the service of Jera before him with our burnt-offerings and sacrifices and peace-offerings, that your sons may not say to our sons in time to come, You have no part in Jera." (Joshua 22: 22-28.) In a rude age, when letters were unknown, or the imperfect Egyptian systems of letters only were in use, and the use of those confined to few, such a testimonial might be deemed necessary to perpetuate a knowledge of the common interest of those Hebrews east of the Jordan in the worship of Jera, with those on the west side of it; but with Aramean letters in use, and with inscriptions would have been called for, if any; but this was without inscriptions. Both these monuments have the appearance of being fictitious. Neither the stone heap nor the altar of

witness is attested by any valid evidence. The crossing of the Jordan in the manner specified is undoubtedly a fiction, and signifies a crossing by natural means, accomplished by the favor of Jera. It is a beautiful allegory, but cannot be admitted as a narrative of facts without the strongest attestation of its reality. Instead of being strongly attested, it has no attestation at all. It would not be credited as a literal fact in any other book but that of Joshua, and is no more entitled to credit as such in Joshua, than it would be in Livy, Herodotus, or Walter Scott.

4. Having quoted some statements and conclusions from the author's work respecting the post-Mosaic origin of the earliest sacred books, the Review asserts, "All these positions are presented as mere assumptions, dicta of the author. No authority of Biblicalists is cited for them, if we except Bunsen on a single point in chronology, and there is but the faintest shadow of fragmentary argument." p. 341. This statement is erroneous in several respects:

(1.) The author's views are not usually first presented as mere assumptions, but as conclusions from legitimate premises. His arguments are brief and condensed, but they are always on hand, and conclusions are kept in close proximity with premises.

(2.) No authority of Biblicalists is cited, because no authority of Biblicalists exists on the subjects considered. Questions of interpretation are not capable of being settled by the authority of Biblicalists. As well might mathematical questions be settled by the authority of mathematicians. The authority of mathematicians can never be substituted for demonstration in mathematics. The attempt to make such a substitution would be regarded as infinitely absurd and ridiculous. In theology this error has been admitted, and has done infinite harm. It is one of the great objects of the author, in all his Biblical works, to draw attention from error authorities to unerring and decisive evidence.

(3.) Bunsen's Chronology is not cited in the author's work, as an authority for the establishment of any proposition, but as an example of the judgment of a learned and laborious scholar on the subject to which it relates. The object of the citation is to encourage inquiry, without indicating any conclusions to be reached.

5. "It fares no better with the prophets than with Moses; the later books of prophecy, Isaiah and Daniel among them, are gross impostures, made up after the events and times of which they speak, and palmed off as the living words of the Lord, at the lips of those whose forged names they bear." p. 647.

That the later books of prophecy, Isaiah and Daniel among them, are gross impostures, is an assertion of the critic, not of the work which he is criticising. The reconstructionist entertains no such views of those books, and makes no such charges against them. He regards them as honest books, containing much valuable instruction and information, and his questions respecting them are as to their character and meaning. The reconstructionist does not confound fictitious works with gross impostures. He reckons among them the most important and valuable works of all ages and nations, the heroic poems of the Greeks and Romans, their immortal tragedies, and the heroic and tragic poems of other countries, and of later times. These are not impostures nor forgeries; just as little are the Jewish sacred books liable to the charge of imposture or forgery, for being fictitious. Fiction is a legitimate instrument of instruction, and is necessary for the most effective inculcation of all the higher lessons of piety and virtue. No book is disparaged by being called fictitious; the noblest books of the world, in all countries and ages, are of this kind. The reconstructionist regards the Hebrew sacred books as fictitious, and interprets them as such, not to find less valuable lessons than are derived from them by literalists, but more valuable. Besides other advantages, his method has this, that it makes those books a true chart of the existing laws and dispensations of the Creator, while the method of literalism makes them charts of laws and dispensations that have ceased and passed away. The literalist method makes the Scriptures reveal God as doing several things which he does not do; the method of the reconstructionist reveals him as having done the same things formerly which he still does, and as still doing the same things which he formerly did. Which is the more practical and useful may be easily determined. What we are mainly interested in knowing of God, is what he now does.

6. "But what of the New Testament? Under the principles laid down by our author, how can it escape the general ruin that he has brought on the Old Testament?" p. 652.  
The author has brought no general ruin on the Old Testament. He has examined a part of it, and shown it to possess a fictitious and allegorical character. The Review has not shown the contrary, and cannot show it. Truth can be shown, and untruth cannot. The failure of the Review to demonstrate the incorrectness of the author's conclusions does not arise from any want of critical ability on the part of the Review, but from the impracticability of the object; truth cannot be put in the wrong.

With these few remarks on the shortcomings of the Boston Review, the author begs leave to request its reconsideration of his work, and of the subject to which his letters relate. If the reconstructionist is misled, let his errors be shown. The points in question are matters of fact, to be determined by evidence, and can be determined by no other means. They embrace the following propositions, which challenge examination:—

1. Aramean letters are a post-Mosaic invention, making the writing of the Pentateuch by Moses impossible.  
2. The Hebrew language of the Pentateuch is the language of the period from 550 B. C. to 100 B. C., and cannot possibly have been the language of the Hebrews at the Exodus from Egypt. Documents may be later than the language to which they belong, but they cannot be earlier. The Pentateuch, therefore, cannot have been written long previous to 550 B. C.

3. The history of Creation in six days cannot possibly be a narrative of facts, and must therefore be accepted as fictitious.  
4. The creation of Adam and Eve, the use of the forbidden fruit, and its consequences, the banishment of Adam and Eve from Paradise, their attaining a knowledge of right and wrong, putting on clothing, and commencing labor and civilization, are represented by allegories and enigmas, and should be interpreted to the times of Samuel.

The fictitious and allegorical character of portions of these narratives is not assumed arbitrarily, but for reasons; and for such reasons as are deemed valid authority for such assumptions in the Greek and Latin classics, in English, German and French literatures, and in all non-Judaic literatures, ancient and modern. Domination is cheap, it is easy to dogmatize, and if the reconstructionist is wrong, it will not be difficult to prove him so. He asks no favor for his errors, and entertains no fear for his truths; they cannot be injured, still less overturned.

The Boston Review is a professed defender of orthodoxy in religious opinions. Orthodoxy is judging according to evidence and correct rules, and not according to any false rule. Evidence is the only ultimate rule of faith; wherever found it is decisive, and nothing else is. Truths may be taken second-hand, or a hundredth-hand, by tradition; but such taking always incurs a liability to mistake. The first traditionist may have been mistaken, and have delivered a false judgment, in which case the error will continue on till the subject is re-examined on its evidence, and any one of a hundred successive traditionists may have taken something away or have added something improperly, and thus have corrupted the truth.

It is quite evident that the Boston Review, in the present case, has rushed to the rescue of old opinions with too much haste and too little consideration. Old opinions are not our gods, they are our servants; good servants only when correct—when incorrect, very bad ones. The Review has assailed the author's work, which is mainly argumentative, and pronounced

it wrong without proving it so. This is not becoming a champion of orthodoxy. A just judge would pain to ascertain, by evidence, and takes unwarranted, dogmatical, systematic and estimate; it is an act of judgment, and admits none that are false and drop them acted the part of a just judge not of an orthodox thinker. It has not restricted its judgments to an orthodox evidence exhibited on the subject, nor exercised due care in respect to its secondary rules of judging. Its method in religious inquiry is like that of a mathematician who should study the conclusions arrived at by mathematicians, and take them on authority, instead of taking them on proof. There is no ultimate authority for propositions but proof; and this is equally true in religious and moral science, and the other sciences. Men can establish by testimony facts as they are witnesses. All higher truths are assumed by reason. Reason begins where testimony ends, and the infinite void beyond is everywhere open to its explorations.

With these remarks, the author of the Reconstruction of Biblical Theories begs leave to commend his work to the impartial examination of all earnest inquirers after truth, and to solicit a candid and thorough judgment of Christendom on the subject therein considered.

Yours, very truly, L. A. SAWYER.

## LETTER FROM WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, JAN. 12, 1863.

DEAR MR. GARRISON:—I have not seen the Liberator during the last few weeks until to-day, and am sorry to learn, for the first time, that you have been compelled to take into consideration the subject of discontinuing its publication. Just when the principles for which it has so long and justly contended are about to be triumphant, and the most unfortunate time for it to be discontinued. We need the voices of the Liberator, if possible, more now than ever. As a personal matter, I do not know how I could do without it. I have now been a subscriber sixteen years, and it has become a necessity to me. I enclose three dollars to pay for it as long as the Financial Committee deems it expedient, then you are at liberty to call for more.

A week ago to-day, James Freeman Clark preached in the Senate Chamber. I did not know of the meeting, and therefore was not present, but saw from an intelligent man that Mr. Clark's effort was one of his very best, and this, of course, is saying much. To-day, Wm. H. Channing preached in the same place. This is to put that costly hall to good use, at least once a week. The occasion reminded me of the memorable days when Theodore Parker, with almost miraculous power, stirred the hearts and waked the heads of the true representatives of the Puritans in Music Hall. The Senate floor was well filled, and the galleries sprinkled with the very chosen people of this modern Sodom. It is true that Bishop Simpson, of the M. E. Church, one of the most eloquent pulpits orators of modern times, preached at the same hour in one of the fashionable churches, and had among his hearers President Lincoln and a Cabinet minister or two, and that Mr. Lincoln gave two hundred dollars to be made a life-member of the Methodist Missionary Society, and that the collection amounted to about seven hundred dollars; yet still I shall insist, that the very choicest spirits of Washington went to hear Mr. Channing.

Mr. Channing said he proposed to preach "a Gospel sermon," and he did. The great principles of love and good will among men were applied to the condition of our suffering, distressed, and ruined country. All the horrors of this terrible battle cry called war were held up to view with awful fidelity. The contrast of a condition of peace with its ample fruits was presented. But then came the full warning of the danger of any, the least compromise; and the utter impossibility of securing peace without the complete recognition of parity and justice by the nation, in its dealings with the lowest and poorest, was earnestly and eloquently set forth. The speaker—"We must meet out full and perfect justice to the negro. We must admit him to all the rights and privileges of society which we claim for ourselves, and this from motives of love and good will, before the nation can be saved." This was the voice which the speaker heard always and everywhere, and this he must dare to proclaim. To him, this was the voice of God, and he believed it to be the almost universal consciousness of men, notwithstanding the plottings and secret councils of demagogues and sneaks—such sneaks as affect contempt for Patriotism, and propose "to leave New England to the cold," when the broken fragments of the Union shall be again united. Out upon such people, who, in the name of the nation, are so ready to sell out the principles of justice and equity for a few dollars!

I do not claim to give the language of the eloquent preacher, but only my impressions from memory. Mr. Channing spoke about fifty minutes, and entirely without notes, but every word and sentence fell from his lips like the most condensed and beautiful pearls into which the language can be formed. What a contrast between such a sermon and the noisy, empty, classical trash commonly called sermons! It was the first tolerable preach I had heard for several years, and chiefly because there was nothing to remind one of the priest, except the black gown which he wore, resembling the gown of the judges of the Supreme Court. I thought it very strange that he should consent to wear such a uniform, but "there is no accounting for tastes."

I congratulate the Abolitionists on the conversion of Gen. B. F. Butler, and beg to express the hope that so distinguished and efficient a coadjutor will be welcomed to their ranks with due honors, that others may be encouraged likewise to repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

The Proclamation of Freedom is gaining friends daily, and the traitorous croakers are growing less. Richardson, Seymour & Co. have met with no encouragement from Brother Jeff. in respect to their proffered compromise, and their biographies and actions are rounding in their points within the lines of the War Democracy. I venture the prediction, that three months from this time, these men will not be apprehended, in consequence of their traitorous scheme, is no longer feared. They are powerless in mischief of much magnitude. Washington is rapidly being colonized by Northern men with Northern principles. When the restoration shall have taken place, public sentiment here will have been reformed, and Northern Congressmen will find it easier to keep their principles from spoiling during their stay at the capital. This will be a great point gained.

A. J. GROVER.

## WEIS &amp; ZOEBISCH.

MANUFACTURERS AND DEALERS IN  
European and Fancy Furs.  
308 Washington Street, BOSTON.  
OPPOSITE BOSTON THEATRE, TO THE RIGHT.  
Particular attention is paid to altering and repairing Old Furs.  
Furs preserved during the summer.